REPORT

REPORT of the Advisory Committee on Policing

85-0979/

REPORT OF THE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON POLICING

Advisory Committee on Policing

October 1984

CONTENTS

	Page
Background	1
Committee Discussions	2
Recommendations	5

Schedules:

Schedule 1 - Revenue Raised from a One Mill Levy Against R.M.'s, L.G.D.'s, Urban Municipalities Under 750 Population

Schedule 2 - Revenue Raised from a One Mill Levy by Municipality

Schedule 3 and 4 - Police Grant Program Options

REPORT OF THE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON POLICING

Background:

The Advisory Committee on Policing Costs was established by the Honourable Andy Anstett, Minister of Municipal Affairs in May of 1984. Membership included Reeves Alan Beachell and David Harms, representing the Union of Manitoba Municipalities (U.M.M.); and Mayors Max Friesen and Jim Tomko, representing the Manitoba Association of Urban Municipalities (M.A.U.M.). Mr. Robert L. Brown of the Department of Municipal Affairs was named to chair the Committee. In addition to the official committee membership, Mr. Charles Gall was appointed as an alternate to the Committee by M.A.U.M., and attended the Committee meetings. Mr. Charles Hill, Director of Law Enforcement Services for the Province of Manitoba, provided the necessary liaison with the Attorney-Generals Department.

The terms of reference for the committee can best be summarized through a series of questions:

Who should pay for Policing Services?

Should all municipalities contribute towards the cost of Policing?

Should the Province subsidize policing costs and if so, to which municipalities?

If there is to be a provincial subsidy, then what should the formula be for that subsidy?

If a subsidy is required, should the source of that subsidy be a municipal levy, the provincial consolidated fund or a combination of these two possibilities?

Committee Discussions:

At its initial meeting, the Committee received a presentation on the provision of police service in Manitoba. The briefing included an outline of the Canada/Manitoba Agreement for policing and the types of police service utilized by different categories of Manitoba municipalities.

The Committee went on to examine the limitations of the existing system of policing cost distribution and of the existing grant subsidization program. These limitations include:

Distribution of Costs - A large group of municipalities, comprised of all R.M.'s and incorporated centres of less than 750, currently receive free R.C.M.P. police service. The $25 million cost for this service is absorbed by the Province.

All incorporated urban municipalities with a population in excess of 750 are required under The Municipal Act to provide police protection. Those in the category of from 750 to 1,500 in population are eligible for R.C.M.P. service under what are known as "extension contracts". Most communities in this range utilize this option. Alternatively, the option of providing their own police force is available and has been adopted by several municipalities.

Urban municipalities with a population in excess of 1,500 also have two choices. With the authorization of the Attorney-General, they may sign "municipal contracts" directly with the federal government for

the provision of R.C.M.P. service or they may independently provide their own police force.

The Committee recognizes that in many cases there is little relationship between the degree of police service received and the cost to the taxpayers of the individual municipalities. Also, the smaller (with populations of less than 750) centres may not receive the higher profile service that the larger urban municipalities do. On the other hand, the Committee is aware that these municipalities do receive an equal standard of police service (e.g. patrols, response to calls, range patrol) and that they are receiving this service at no cost. On the urban side, costs may differ based on the method of policing, i.e. "extension contracts", "municipal contracts", or own force. Costs will also differ because of the separate issue of the relationship between the degree of police protection needed in the urban municipality as compared to the strength of its assessment base. Crime rates are not the same in all parts of the Province, therefore, urban municipalities with nearly identical populations but in different areas of the Province find their needs for police servicing differing greatly. Costs will be a function of the degree of service needed applied against the assessment base.

Inequities in the Grant Program - The Police Cost Grant Program is available primarily to all incorporated urban municipalities in the 750 to 1,500 population range. The total amount of the grant program in 1984 was approximately $194,000. The original premise for this program

was that these smaller urban municipalities were paying a relatively higher rate for policing services than were the larger urban centres and that some relief should be provided in recognition of this presumed fact. Current statistics, however, indicate that while urban municipalities in the 750 to 1,500 range may require a higher mill rate than some of the larger urban centre, this is certainly not always the case. In fact, many of Manitoba's largest urban centres require quite a bit higher mill rate than the small centres to pay for policing costs (See Schedule 4).

Even among those communities eligible for the grant program, inequities exist. The original formula applied grants based upon the relationship of the communities equalized assessment to that of other communities in this population range and to the established cost of an R.C.M.P. constable. The three variables, i.e. the communities in question, their equalized assessment, and the cost of the constable, changed each year but the formula was never updated accordingly and soon the grants were being distributed in a manner that bore little resemblence to the original rationale. At the present time there is no real statistical justification for either the choice of community receiving the grant or for the amount of grant received.

The Committee gave special attention to the issue of the 750 population threshold regarding the mandatory provision of police services in incorporated centres. Based on these discussions, a recommendation is put forward later in this report

which will moderate the impact of this first time expense for policing. The Committee, however, rejected the option of either changing the threshold population or of allowing a variation of some type, e.g. a five percent variance from 750. The Municipal Act provides an urban community with a population of 750 or higher with the option of seeking incorporated status. With incorporated status comes the right to elect a council and mayor and the attendent privileges of self-government. Accompanying these rights, however, are certain responsibilities which are expected of local government in the way of provision of services.

One of these services, as legislated in The Municipal Act, is the provision of police service and as with most services there are costs associated with its provision. The Committee is of the opinion that incorporation is a voluntary process which communities enter into knowing that there will be costs attached. The Committee has sought to cushion the initial impact of the costs of policing but does not feel that a change in the legislation in this regard is in order.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Committee concluded that any solutions to the identified inequities should be predicated on the following points:

1. All municipalities should contribute something towards the cost of policing.

2. Any formula for cost distribution should take into account the more visible degree of service urban municipalities receive as compared to their rural counterparts.

3. The variation in costs among urbans due to factors beyond their control should be moderated.

4. Any additional contributions derived from the municipalities should be used to moderate the inequities, not to reduce the provincial contribution to policing.

The Committee, therefore, recommends the following formula for the distribution of costs and grants:

1. All municipalities currently receiving free services will contribute one mill on their equalized assessment towards the cost of policing.

2. The revenue raised from the one mill levy plus the monies paid by the Province into the Police Grants Program will be utilized to limit the maximum cost of police services across all urban municipalities of greater than 750 population, excluding the City of Winnipeg.

3. The formula for the new Urban Policing Cost Equalization Grant would be based on measuring an average net mill rate for policing costs in urban municipalities. The

net figure would be arrived at by subtracting the amount of Urban Services Supplement a municipality receives from its gross policing costs. For example:

Step 1: Determine Net Policing Costs of Urban Municipality #1;

Gross Policing Costs of	$32,839
-Urban Services Supplement of	5,018
Net Policing Costs of	$27,821

Step 2: Convert Net Policing Costs $ to mills for Urban Municipality #1;

$$\frac{\text{Net Policing Costs of } \$27,821}{\text{Equalized Assessment of } 1,482,730} = 18.76 \text{ Mills}$$

Step 3: Repeat Steps 1 and 2 for all urban municipalities in the Province and calculate the average mill rate for net policing costs.

4. A grant would be issued to each urban municipality whose necessary mill rate for net policing costs exceeded the provincial average, i.e. if the average costs of policing services to all Manitoba urban municipalities was 16 mills and municipality's "X" costs were 18 mills, municipality "X" would receive a grant equivalent to the two mill differential identified.

5. In addition, a phase-in grant supplement would be available to urban municipalities becoming eligible for the first time for police costs, i.e. those reaching 750

population. This grant would reimburse the municipality for 75% of their police costs in Year 1; 50% in Year 2; 25% in Year 3; and 0% in Year 4. If at any time the municipality's costs exceeded the average mill rate described in Item 4 above, the municipality would become eligible for the standard grant.

Costs associated with this formula are approximately $950,000 (1982 dollars). Revenues generated from the one mill levy plus the monies from the existing grant program total to approximately $1,022,000 in 1984 dollars. A detailed breakdown of revenues and expenditures is shown in the Schedules attached.

The impact of this recommended formula on individual urban municipalities is shown in Schedule 4 attached.

The Committee would like to qualify its above recommendations by stating that it regrets that the only means available by which municipalities can raise revenue is by a tax on real property. The Committee is concerned about the present inequities in the assessment system and would have preferred to avoid any additional tax levied on this basis but no practical alternative would seem to be available. It is the hope of the Committee that assessment reform will proceed expeditiously and will resolve some of these difficulties. However, should reform result in market value assessments, the recommended one mill levy would have to be revised downwards. A smaller mill rate applied to a larger assessment base would produce the same revenue required for policing.

This report has not dealt with the 14 rural municipalities and one resort municipality which will receive grants this year to subsidize police costs incurred in 1983. These grants are calculated at the lesser of one-third actual costs or $2.00 per capita for rural municipalities and 25% actual costs for the resort municipality. The Committee is of the opinion that these municipalities should be subject to grant assistance on the same basis as towns and village under our proposed new formula. In other words, if these municipalities choose to provide their own police force and their costs, including the one mill levy, exceed the net average mill rate for policing, then they would be eligible for assistance.

Utilizing the 1982 financial information, none of the municipalities in question here exceed the provincial average however, so the cost of the total program remains unchanged.

The Committee would also like to bring to your attention the series of options listed in Schedules 3 and 4 of this report. The Committee feels that if the proposed changes in the distribution of costs are not acceptable, there are still changes that can be made to the police grants program alone that would be an improvement on the existing system. The options presented all utilize a formula based on net police costs. The choice among these options will likely have to be based on the amount of provincial monies available for the program. Of these, Option 5 is preferred and it would see a grant program based upon net policing costs available to all urban municipalities in Manitoba outside the City of Winnipeg. This would require a substantial increase in the amount of provincial monies contributed to the grant program however, and it is recognized

that in this time of restraint such monies may be difficult to find. The Committee did not wish to list these options as part of the report proper since it was felt that each of the options were totally dependent on provincial monies only and that any decision in this regard was strictly a matter for provincial consideration.

The Committee trusts that you will find its delibrations and recommendations useful.

SCHEDULES

SCHEDULE 1

Revenue Raised From a 1 Mill Levy Against
R.M.'s, L.G.D.'s and Urbans Under 750 Population

	Equalized Assessment (1984)	Total Levy	Average Levy/ Municipality
Rurals	730,606,160	$730,606	$6,958
L.G.D.'s	63,125,700	63,126	4,509
Villages	28,814,610	28,815	1,067
Towns	5,228,050	5,228	1,307
TOTAL	827,774,520	$827,775	$5,518

SCHEDULE 2

Revenue Raised From 1 Mill Levy

By Individual Municipality

RURALS	POPULATION (1981 Census)	EQUALIZED ASSESSMENT (1984)	LEVY
Albert	622	3,254,300	$ 3,254
Archie	627	3,323,870	3,324
Argyle	1,420	5,326,480	5,327
Arthur	779	4,247,280	4,247
Bifrost	2,691	6,374,970	6,375
Birtle	1,067	5,334,000	5,334
Blanshard	776	5,031,920	5,032
Boulton	509	2,021,410	2,021
Brenda	852	5,865,660	5,866
Brokenhead	3,032	8,726,850	8,727
Cameron	683	3,578,690	3,579
Cartier	2,805	9,553,740	9,554
Clanwilliam	572	1,460,300	1,460
Coldwell	1,472	2,573,920	2,574
Cornwallis	3,777	9,561,870	9,562
Daly	1,325	5,336,070	5,336
Dauphin	2,943	8,040,130	8,040
De Salaberry	2,719	10,026,350	10,026
Dufferin	2,707	12,513,930	12,514
East St. Paul	3,596	11,532,100	11,532
Edward	946	4,087,660	4,088
Ellice	513	2,250,090	2,250
Elton	1,412	6,357,600	6,358
Eriksdale	1,017	1,718,570	1,719
Ethelbert	767	2,153,760	2,154
Franklin	2,049	8,689,630	8,690
Gilbert Plains	1,377	5,547,020	5,547
Gimli	2,375	11,585,750	11,586
Glenella	741	2,256,550	2,257
Glenwood	841	4,481,440	4,481

RURALS	POPULATION (1981 Census)	EQUALIZED ASSESSMENT (1984)	LEVY
Grandview	1,267	4,649,850	$ 4,650
Grey	2,194	10,118,040	10,118
Hamiota	713	5,071,040	5,071
Hanover	7,428	15,580,070	15,580
Harrison	1,093	4,355,060	4,355
Hillsburg	671	1,581,250	1,581
La Broquerie	1,638	3,757,820	3,758
Lac du Bonnet	2,239	7,285,290	7,285
Lakeview	568	1,995,790	1,996
Langford	772	3,103,480	3,103
Lansdowne	1,148	3,259,100	3,259
Lawrence	866	1,792,930	1,793
Lorne	2,425	9,367,190	9,367
Louise	1,303	7,835,780	7,836
MacDonald	3,403	19,275,620	19,276
McCreary	755	2,179,170	2,179
Miniota	1,196	5,679,320	5,679
Minitonas	1,369	6,434,990	6,435
Minto	698	2,893,620	2,894
Montcalm	1,769	6,282,790	6,283
Morris	2,971	15,417,020	15,417
Morton	939	6,268,040	6,268
Mossey River	1,061	2,341,290	2,341
North Cypress	2,004	13,769,950	13,770
North Norfolk	3,047	8,486,670	8,487
Oakland	1,003	5,276,690	5,277
Ochre River	1,110	2,727,000	2,727
Odanah	556	2,979,720	2,980
Pembina	2,180	10,461,630	10,462
Pipestone	2,073	8,621,070	8,621
Portage La Prairie	7,054	30,063,830	30,064
Rhineland	4,525	17,298,450	17,298
Richot	4,262	12,411,850	12,412

RURALS	POPULATION (1981 Census)	EQUALIZED ASSESSMENT (1984)	LEVY
Riverside	979	4,308,550	$ 4,309
Roblin	997	4,502,570	4,503
Rockwood	6,320	15,860,220	15,860
Roland	974	7,167,230	7,167
Rosedale	1,886	4,295,930	4,296
Rossburn	766	3,265,790	3,266
Rosser	1,326	8,189,870	8,190
Russell	653	3,296,500	3,297
St. Andrews	7,990	24,485,690	24,486
Ste. Anne	3,035	6,578,440	6,578
St. Clements	6,309	20,238,840	20,249
St. Francois Xavier	780	3,604,180	3,604
St. Laurent	1,114	2,387,290	2,387
Ste. Rose	1,168	2,525,030	2,525
Saskatchewan	789	4,953,070	4,953
Shellmouth	886	3,105,540	3,106
Shell River	1,161	4,397,170	4,397
Shoal Lake	846	3,971,740	3,972
Sifton	820	3,693,240	3,693
Siglunes	1,596	3,191,680	3,192
Silver Creek	696	3,582,380	3,582
South Cypress	855	4,304,400	4,304
South Norfolk	1,285	5,442,490	5,442
Springfield	8,986	28,375,440	28,375
Stanley	4,257	14,174,440	14,174
Strathclair	1,224	4,684,900	4,685
Strathcona	1,016	3,527,300	3,527
Swan River	3,273	10,744,570	10,745
Tache	5,893	13,886,840	13,887
Thompson	1,364	6,077,410	6,077
Turtle Mountain	1,338	7,118,580	7,119
Victoria	1,431	5,092,850	5,093
Victoria Beach	215	3,121,170	3,121

RURALS	POPULATION (1981 Census)	EQUALIZED ASSESSMENT (1984)	LEVY
Wallace	2,044	7,359,160	$ 7,359
Westbourne	2,017	7,414,200	7,414
West St. Paul	2,745	8,962,510	8,963
Whitehead	1,291	5,590,030	5,590
Whitemouth	1,836	4,096,080	4,096
Whitewater	856	5,253,150	5,253
Winchester	828	4,710,670	4,711
Woodlands	2,935	7,031,570	7,032
Woodworth	1,125	4,604,140	4,604
L.G.D.'s			
Alexander	1,908	9,739,850	9,740
Alonsa	2,315	3,504,640	3,505
Armstrong	1,957	2,688,170	2,688
Churchill	1,304	6,409,860	6,410
Consol	3,293	6,399,560	6,400
Fisher	2,321	5,137,520	5,138
Grahamdale	2,192	4,071,110	4,071
Grand Rapids	645	1,885,210	1,885
Mountain	2,621	5,696,640	5,697
Mystery Lake	31	1,117,190	1,117
Park	1,443	3,765,740	3,766
Piney	1,890	4,634,510	4,635
Reynolds	1,125	4,306,120	4,306
Stuartburn	1,723	3,769,580	3,770

VILLAGES	POPULATION (1981 Census)	EQUALIZED ASSESSMENT (1984)	LEVY
Benito	441	1,017,850	$ 1,018
Binscarth	472	683,680	684
Bowsman	454	689,580	690
Cartwright	384	570,190	570
Crystal City	489	1,142,700	1,143
Dunnotar	287	2,220,270	2,220
Elkhorn	509	1,014,590	1,015
Erickson	540	1,216,480	1,216
Ethelbert	474	764,450	765
Garson	318	577,910	578
Glenboro	741	1,642,620	1,643
Gretna	545	865,220	865
Hamiota	728	1,873,570	1,874
McCreary	618	1,201,370	1,201
Minitonas	628	1,078,210	1,078
Napinka	132	173,400	173
Notre Dame de Lourdes	627	1,067,430	1,067
Plum Coulee	592	1,239,650	1,240
Powerview	691	783,190	783
Riverton	657	976,480	976
Rossburn	696	1,644,250	1,644
St. Claude	592	1,401,840	1,402
St. Lazare	414	606,440	606
Somerset	596	1,114,100	1,114
Treherne	743	1,844,280	1,844
Waskada	239	489,360	489
Wawanesa	492	915,500	916

TOWNS	POPULATION (1981 Census)	EQUALIZED ASSESSMENT (1984)	LEVY
Hartney	490	1,068,940	$ 1,069
Oak Lake	369	661,600	662
Rapid City	431	677,220	677
Winnipeg Beach	565	2,820,290	2,820

SCHEDULE 3

POLICE GRANT PROGRAM OPTIONS

1. A grant would be issued to urban municipalities with populations 750 - 1,500 whose necessary mill rate for net policing costs exceeded the 1982 average mill rate of 15.25 for urban municipalities of 750 - 1,500 persons. The total grant required to subsidize the group would be $46,841. Under this option, ten communities have an above average mill rate for policing and would therefore be eligible for grants.

2. A grant would be issued to urban municipalities with populations 750 - 1,500 whose necessary mill rate for net policing costs exceeded the 1982 average mill rate of 13.19 for urban communities of 750 - 5,000 persons. The total grant required to subsidize this group would be $96,012. Under this option, 16 communities have an above average mill rate for policing and would therefore be eligible for grants.

3. A grant would be issued to urban municipalities with populations 750 - 5,000 whose necessary mill rate for net policing costs exceeded the 1982 average mill rate of 13.19 for urban communities of 750 - 5,000 persons. The total grant required to subsidize this group would be $179,547. Under this option, 21 communities have an above average mill rate for policing and would therefore be eligible for grants.

4. A grant would be issued to urban municipalities with populations 750 - 15,000 whose necessary mill rate for net policing costs exceeded the 1982 average mill rate of 13.56 for urban communities of 750 - 15,000. The total grant required to subsidize this group would be $591,316. Under this option, 23 communities have an above average mill rate for policing and would therefore be eligible for grants.

5. A grant would be issued to all urban municipalities, except the City of Winnipeg whose necessary mill rate for net policing costs exceeded this groups 1982 average mill rate of 14.00. The total grant required to subsidize this group would be $933,753. Under this option, 22 communities have an above average mill rate for policing and would therefore be eligible for grants.

6. All of the above options would also include a supplementary phase-in grant for towns or villages required to provide policing services for the first time. The supplementary grant would be paid to each new community as follows:

YEAR 1: 75% of net policing costs or approximately $31,275.
YEAR 2: 50% of net policing costs or approximately $21,203.
YEAR 3: 25% of net policing costs or approximately $12,205.

SCHEDULE 4

POLICE GRANT PROGRAM OPTIONS

URBAN MUNICIPALITY	POPULATION (1981 Census)	NET POLICING COST (1982)	POLICING MILL RATE (1982)	CURRENT GRANTS (1983/84)	GRANTS UNDER PROPOSED FORMULA	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 5	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 4	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 3	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 2	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 1
POPULATIONS 750-1,500										
Arborg (V)	974	$ 29,847	13.27	$ 6,019	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 180	$ 180	$ -
Birtle (T)	887	30,174	17.39	6,019	5,883	5,883	6,594	7,289	7,289	3,991
Deloraine (T)	1,136	48,730	16.74	3,489	7,976	7,976	9,024	10,188	10,188	4,075
Emerson (T)	762	28,642[1]	18.34	-	6,777	6,777	7,339	7,963	7,963	4,685
Gilbert Plains (V)	812	28,403	14.82	6,881	1,571	1,571	2,300	3,006	3,006	-
Gillam (L.G.D.)	1,427	151,386	10.52	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Gladstone (T)	964	27,995	13.25	7,741	-	-	-	127	127	-
Grandview (T)	1,013	29,013	12.44	4,300	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lac du Bonnet (V)	985	37,323	15.69	4,300	4,020	4,020	4,995	5,947	5,947	952
MacGregor (V)	795	29,635	19.13	9,461	7,947	7,947	8,520	9,140	9,140	5,887
Manitou (V)	861	29,387	13.02	5,160	-	-	-	-	-	-
Melita (T)	1,156	23,781	8.32	785	-	-	-	-	-	-
Niverville (V)	1,329	27,632	10.62	8,601	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pilot Mound (V)	838	28,357[1]	14.96	-	1,820	1,820	2,654	3,222	3,222	-
Rivers (T)	1,107	44,308	18.87	5,160	11,432	11,432	12,442	13,146	13,146	8,541
Ste. Anne (V)	1,338	27,821	18.76	9,461	7,058	7,058	7,710	8,155	8,155	5,190
St. Pierre (V)	919	29,170	13.88	10,324	-	-	631	1,261	1,261	-
Ste. Rose (V)	1,090	28,528	15.85	10,324	3,331	3,331	3,961	4,681	4,681	1,080
Shoal Lake (V)	835	30,894	16.91	7,741	5,317	5,317	6,030	6,761	6,761	2,924
Teulon (V)	925	30,031	14.64	9,461	1,293	1,293	2,054	2,874	2,874	-
Winnipegosis (V)	855	28,410	21.06	11,18.	11,160	11,160	11,702	12,072	12,072	9,608

(1) Estimated

URBAN MUNICIPALITY	POPULATION (1981 Census)	NET POLICING COST (1982)	POLICING MILL RATE (1982)	CURRENT GRANTS (1983/84)	GRANTS UNDER PROPOSED FORMULA	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 5	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 4	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 3	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 2	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 1
POPULATIONS 1,500-5,000										
Altona (T)	2,757	$ 95,105	11.74	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	Not Eligible	Not Eligible
Beausejour (T)	2,462	45,375	7.14	-	-	-	-	-	"	"
Boissevain (T)	1,660	47,128	11.90	-	-	-	-	-	"	"
Carberry (T)	1,510	26,927	9.11	5,160	-	-	-	-	"	"
Carman (T)	2,408	72,157	10.11	-	-	-	-	-	"	"
Gimli (T)	1,550	94,220	21.98	-	34,203	34,203	36,003	37,289	"	"
Killarney (T)	2,356	73,918	10.66	-	-	-	-	-	"	"
Leaf Rapids (T)	2,356	156,849	12.97	-	-	-	-	-	"	"
Lynne Lake (LGD)	2,142	101,579	12.49	-	-	-	-	-	"	"
Minnedosa (T)	2,637	111,230	15.86	-	13,041	13,041	16,126	18,230	"	"
Morden (T)	4,579	126,064	8.38	-	-	-	-	-	"	"
Morris (T)	1,570	27,038	6.62	785	-	-	-	-	"	"
Neepawa (T)	3,425	109,623	10.94	-	-	-	-	-	"	"
Pinawa (LGD)	2,011	50,890	4.09	-	-	-	-	-	"	"
Roblin (T)	1,953	49,058	10.12	-	-	-	-	-	"	"
Russell (T)	1,660	50,917	10.99	-	-	-	-	-	"	"
Snow Lake (T)	1,853	28,881	7.67	-	-	-	-	-	"	"
Souris (T)	1,731	68,544	16.79	-	11,389	11,389	13,063	14,696	"	"
Stonewall (T)	2,222	75,529	16.04	-	9,608	9,608	11,304	13,188	"	"
Swan River (T)	3,782	190,385	13.97	-	-	-	5,451	133	"	"
Virden (T)	2,940	104,240	13.05	-	-	-	-	-	"	"

URBAN MUNICIPALITY	POPULATION (1981 Census)	NET POLICING COST (1982)	POLICING MILL RATE (1982)	CURRENT GRANTS (1983/84)	GRANTS UNDER PROPOSED FORMULA	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 5	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 4	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 3	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 2	GRANTS UNDER OPTION 1
POPULATIONS 5,000 - 15,000										
Dauphin (T)	8,971	283,239	9.56	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	Not Eligible	Not Eligible	Not Eligible
Flin Flon (C)	7,895	340,771	14.27	-	6,449	6,449	16,720	"	"	"
Portage (C)	13,086	539,352	14.77	-	28,125	28,125	43,832	"	"	"
Selkirk (T)	10,037	531,091	21.87	-	191,138	191,138	201,582	"	"	"
Steinbach (T)	6,676	196,366	10.59	-	-	-	-	"	"	"
The Pas (T)	6,390	421,972	21.98	-	153,217	153,217	161,281	"	"	"
Thompson (C)	14,288	876,951	11.49	-	-	-	-	"	"	"
Winkler (T)	5,046	167,106	10.68	-	-	-	-	"	"	"
POPULATIONS > 15,000										
Brandon (C)	36,343	2,078,673	17.51	-	416,797	416,797	Not Eligible	"	"	"